

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

Darrell F. McCoy, Jr.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Bryan Stirling, *Director of South Carolina Dept of Corr*; Dennis Patterson, *Assistant Deputy Director of SCDC*; Willie Davis, *Regional Director of SCDC*; Joel Anderson, *Deputy Director of SCDC*; Jana Hollis, *Deputy Warden Supermax/SSR*; L. Snow, *Grievance Coordinator*; Felicia Mckie, *Grievance Branch Chief*; Stacy Richardson, *Director State Classification/Multi-disciplinary Committee*; Joseph Stines, *Multi-disciplinary Committee*; Brandon Byrd, *Multi-disciplinary Committee*; Esther Laborador, *Multi-disciplinary Committee*; Stephanie Skewes, *Multi-disciplinary Committee*; Ms. Peeples, *Classification (Kirkland)*; Ms. Owens, *Classification (Broadriver)*,

Defendants.

Case No. 8:24-cv-03558-JDA

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on a motion for summary judgment filed by Defendants. [Doc. 41.] In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge William S. Brown for pre-trial proceedings.

On March 31, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("Report") recommending that Defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted.

[Doc. 59.] The Magistrate Judge advised the parties of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if they failed to do so.

[*Id.* at 35.] Plaintiff has not filed objections and the time to do so has lapsed.*

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

The Court has reviewed the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Having done so, the Court accepts the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and incorporates it by reference. Accordingly, Defendants’ motion for summary judgment [Doc. 41] is GRANTED and this action is DISMISSED with prejudice.

* The Court notes that the Report was mailed to Plaintiff at his address of record but was returned as undeliverable. [Doc. 61.] Out of an abundance of caution, the Court re-mailed the Report to Plaintiff on April 17, 2025. [Doc. 62.]

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Jacquelyn D. Austin
United States District Judge

May 19, 2025
Greenville, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.